IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF RHODE ISLAND

- - - - - - - - - - - - - X

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, : 17-CR-00116(WES)

VS.

United States Courthouse

Providence, Rhode Island

1

MARCIO ALEXANDRO

MARTINEZ-LARA, Defendant. Thursday, October 18, 2018

: 2:08 p.m.

. - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - X

TRANSCRIPT OF CRIMINAL CAUSE FOR SENTENCING BEFORE THE HONORABLE WILLIAM E. SMITH UNITED STATES CHIEF DISTRICT COURT JUDGE

APPEARANCES:

For the Government: GERARD B. SULLIVAN, AUSA

U.S. Attorney's Office

50 Kennedy Plaza

Providence, RI 02903

For the Defendant: JOHN F. CICILLINE, ESQ.

Cicilline Law Office 381 Atwells Avenue Providence, RI 02909

Court Reporter: Lisa Schwam, CSR, CRR, RPR, RMR

One Exchange Terrace Providence, RI 02903

Proceedings recorded by computerized stenography. Transcript produced by Computer-Aided Transcription.

(In open court)

THE COURT: All right. Good afternoon. We're here in the matter of the United States vs. Marcio Alexandro Martinez-Lara, and we are here for sentencing this afternoon. Let's have counsel identify themselves for the record, please.

MR. SULLIVAN: Your Honor, Gerard B. Sullivan for the United States.

MR. CICILLINE: John Cicilline for Mr. Martinez.

THE COURT: Thank you very much. I've received the presentence investigation report that was prepared by the Office of Probation in this matter. And Mr. Cicilline, if I could just ask you to confirm on the record that you've had the opportunity to review this report with your client and that you've been able to answer all of his questions.

MR. CICILLINE: I'm sorry, Judge.

THE COURT: I'm asking you if you reviewed the presentence report with your client and were you able to answer all of his questions.

MR. CICILLINE: Have I gone over it with him? THE COURT: Yes.

MR. CICILLINE: The answer is yes.

THE COURT: Okay. And I understand you have an objection to the presentence report?

MR. CICILLINE: I do, your Honor.

THE COURT: So do you want me to hear you on that now?

MR. CICILLINE: It's the objection to the memo I filed. I have nothing to add to it.

THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Sullivan, do you want to respond to the objection that Mr. Cicilline filed?

MR. SULLIVAN: Just briefly, your Honor, because I did not file a written report.

THE COURT: Right, you didn't, yes.

MR. SULLIVAN: Judge, as I understand it, Mr. Cicilline's objection is to a two-point adjustment. In reading his memo, it seemed to suggest that the Court would have to find that the gun was possessed in connection with the 924(c), which he's not being convicted of. The government's going to dismiss that count.

And it's true that the government will dismiss that count and he won't be convicted of that crime, but he possessed the gun in connection with the drug trafficking and in that is likely supported by the evidence, as probation pointed out. The gun is factually anomalous. In this case, the gun was in a hide with drugs. There was also ammunition in there. It was an apartment that was used primarily as a stash

house, not as a residence, for drug dealing. They found a large amount of valuable drugs in that stash house and even a kilo press, indicating it was a large-scale drug operation where a gun would facilitate the drug trafficking.

But this gun, if I recall the pictures correctly, was wrapped in green cellophane or blue cellophane. It was odd. And so that was probably the only triable issue in this case. There was overwhelming evidence on all the many other counts that he's pled guilty to. I would have given those facts to a jury at trial, but for here it wasn't necessary particularly with the joint recommendation to a minimum mandatory sentence. So we're going to dismiss Count Fifteen, the 924(c).

As probation points out, the Court could find that the gun was possessed in connection with drug trafficking. It's a different standard; it's preponderance of the evidence. Connection is pretty broadly defined. So the legal answer is probation is probably correct. The fact -- the practical answer is it doesn't matter. It doesn't matter to the government. It doesn't matter to the sentence that the Court is to impose or to the defendant. It just goes -- it's a technical question about the guidelines.

I'm not asking the Court to be a guidelines vending machine, and you have to correctly calculate them, but it doesn't matter.

And it doesn't even matter to an appeal if the Court imposes a 15-year sentence because he's agreed to waive the appeal. So it's a dispute without a purpose.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you very much.

MR. SULLIVAN: Thank you.

THE COURT: All right. I've considered the defendant's arguments set forth in the motion or objection to the two-point enhancement and the government's response, and I believe the objection has no merit. And so for that reason, I'm going to deny the objection and the enhancement will stand. So I will review now on the record the advisory guideline calculations as they are described in the presentence report.

So there are 12 counts in this case that the defendant has pled guilty to, and they are grouped according to the grouping rules in the guidelines. Group one pertains to the distribution of fentanyl, cocaine, possession with intent to distribute, the same, as well as the heroin and methamphetamine. And the base offense level for those counts is level 32. And that's all set forth in paragraph 38 of the report.

Now, at paragraph 39, it notes there's a two-level increase because the firearm was possessed and it was in close proximity to the controlled substances. That's the matter we just discussed. There's a two-point upward adjustment because the defendant maintained the premises involved for the purposes of manufacturing or distributing controlled substances. That yields an adjusted offense level of 36.

Counts Thirteen and Fourteen, which relate to a felon in possession of a firearm, an alien in possession of a firearm, are grouped together in group two, and the base offense level in that group is a 24. There's a four-point upward adjustment because the firearm was possessed in connection with another felony offense. That yields an adjusted offense level of 28. The combined offense level under the guidelines grouping rules is, therefore, a level 36.

Now, paragraph 53 notes that the defendant receives an additional enhancement, one-point enhancement, because of his two prior felony convictions and, therefore, he is classified as a career offender under Section 4B1.1. So he lands at level 37. Now, the defendant receives three points off his guideline calculation for acceptance of

responsibility so the total offense level is 34.

The defendant's criminal history is summarized in paragraph 63 of the report. He has four criminal history points. He receives two additional points because he committed this offense while under another criminal justice sentence of probation. That gives him six criminal history points. And this would otherwise put him in category III, but because of his classification as a career offender under 4B1.4 and as an armed career criminal, his criminal history calculation is elevated to level VI.

So as a result of his total offense level of 34 and Criminal History Category of VI, the defendant's advisory guideline range is 262 to 327 months of imprisonment. And I would just note that the offenses involved various mandatory minimums, including a mandatory minimum of 15 years on Count Thirteen.

So with all that said, I'll turn to the government first for its recommendation.

MR. SULLIVAN: As the Court's aware, this is a joint recommendation for 15 years. The defendant's illegally present in this country. He's been here for years. He's been convicted in this courthouse and others under various aliases.

This time he's in a mountain of trouble. He's

admitted his identity finally and agreed to deportation by stipulation. It's clear he's not Victor Cardona or Sandro Martinez or any other alias that he's used. He's Marcio Alexandro Martinez-Lara, a 45-year-old offender born in Bonao, the Dominican Republic.

If the Court accepts the joint recommendation, he'll spend the next 15 years in the custody of the Bureau of Prisons at taxpayer expense. And he still has a state outstanding indictment for drug trafficking under the name Sandro Martinez. I don't know what they're going to do with that, but that may add some time.

In any event, with the admissions and stipulations and the joint recommendation, he'll go back out -- he'll go back to Bonao to live out his 60s. I think that despite the calculations in this and despite how much higher just charging like the 924(c) could have made this case, I think 15 years for a 45-year old offender where he's going to be deported anyway is a full and fair resolution of the case. And so that's what I recommend to the Court.

So in structuring it, Count Thirteen, the minimum mandatory is 15 years. Count Fourteen, the maximum sentence is ten years. So it would be ten years on Count Fourteen, fifteen years on all the

remaining counts. Counts Thirteen and Fourteen carry a maximum of three years of supervised release. Some of the remaining counts require five years so it would be three years on Thirteen and Fourteen, five years supervised release on the balance.

He's stipulated to deportation and so I'd ask that there be a condition of supervised release that he surrender to immigration officials and once deported remain outside of the United States as a further condition of supervised release. No fine in this case. And there are \$1400 worth of special assessments. Thank you.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you, Mr. Sullivan. Mr. Cicilline.

MR. CICILLINE: In the world of science fiction, there are forces that permit us to go back in time. Of course, we all understand that in reality it's not possible for such a thing to happen. But if it were possible to go back in time as it relates to this defendant, I think we'd have a different outcome and I think that he probably would not be here today.

He grew up in a tough environment, abusive home.

He left that environment to go live with an uncle in

Puerto Rico and that kind of abuse continued on. In

the beginning he was involved in some very menial jobs

but never able to make enough money to support the family, the extended family, that he basically adopted; the number of kids he had, the friends, the relatives, all the people he felt responsible for. So he turned to this life in drugs. And until he got caught, he never ever thought about the implications of what he was doing and how it impacted on other people.

Since his arrest, he's gone through a change in life, so to speak. He now realizes the immorality of what he did, the unlawfulness of what he did, and he's truly sorry about it. And I'm not certain that I can convey to the Court sufficiently the change that this man has made in his life. I suggested in the pretrial memorandum which I filed in this case that not only has he demonstrated this change by his lack of trouble at Wyatt, he's indicated that he'd be willing to help the government to stop the kind of thing he was doing. And for him, that's a major turnabout in his life.

He is a totally different person than he had been while he was out and doing all these illegal things. He's got a new commitment. I don't know whether it comes from involvement in religion at Wyatt or whatever it was, but he now is committed to keeping his life straight.

And Congress had this in mind when it enacted

that portion of the Sentencing Act that we now refer to as the parsimony principle. The sentence imposed should not be greater than necessary to achieve the objectives. I know he's a repeat drug offender. I know that his life up to the time of this arrest has not been a model for anybody, but he has changed and he is a different person.

And under the principle of parsimony, 15 years is a long, long time. And I don't think that even that much is necessary, but if it must be, it must be. Fifteen years will accomplish all the objectives intended for sentencing. It will demonstrate to the Court that he understands the change in his life but, more importantly, it will say to him that you can't do this again. And if you do, the next time there's going to be no opportunity to get out. So I suggest to you that you follow our joint recommendation and sentence the defendant accordingly.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Cicilline.

All right. Mr. Martinez, do you wish to say anything before I impose the sentence?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

Good afternoon, your Honor.

THE COURT: Good afternoon.

THE DEFENDANT: Your Honor, I understand and I

know that I've committed a very serious crime. When I was sentenced in the past, at that time I did not have any children, but currently I'm a father of five children. I am so very sorry of what I did. I understand that I have caused harm to many people. But to leave my children -- or after leaving my children, I realize that there is nothing as important or more important than family.

Your Honor, I want you to understand that what I'm saying does not mean that I'm telling you that I do not deserve a sentence. What I do want you to understand, your Honor, is that I feel very bad and I feel very guilty about what I did, especially because I'm leaving my children behind. They'll be alone. And I'm leaving my family.

I know that he knows that we are human. And I hope you take into account that I will be deported to my home country. I know that in my country I will do things very differently because I have changed, and I have changed by just seeing my children when they see me. And I didn't see things as I see them now, but I want you to know, your Honor, that I'm going back to my home country and I will not do the things that I did before. I thank you very much for listening to me.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Martinez. You can

remain standing.

I appreciate your comments, and I appreciate the comments of Mr. Cicilline on your behalf. And I'm very happy to hear that he believes that you have decided to change your behavior and your ways. I'm glad to hear you say it because what is clear from your criminal history and from this offense is that you've been pretty much dealing drugs for a living for a long time. And the amounts of drugs involved in this case were very serious, significant amounts. The types of drugs that you were involved with are bringing terrible destruction to our community and communities all around the country.

Every time I impanel a jury, as I did yesterday in a case involving narcotics, I have to speak to people whose families have been partially destroyed because of opioid addiction and death from overdose. I listened to several people yesterday in the jury that I impaneled who cried uncontrollably as I spoke to them about what had happened in their lives and their families as a result of the drugs, so much that they didn't feel they could be a fair juror.

This is something that I hear over and over and over again, and we read about it and hear about it in the newspapers and magazines and you watch it on TV and

we just see it all around us. And it just can't be overstated the role that you played in distributing these killer drugs into the community. So I hope you realize just how horrible that is, because you bear responsibility, you and a lot of others, but with others you bear responsibility for bringing this destruction upon so many people.

And I don't want to sugarcoat it; that's really what it is. And I hope you're sincere when you tell me that you have finally decided you don't want to be a part of that destruction. I hope you are sincere.

So the recommendation here, I'm prepared to accept it. The guideline range obviously is much higher than what is recommended. There are many ways that the sentence in this case could have been much higher. The government could have charged you in a different way to bring upon more prison time. I know you're aware of all that, the way they handled the charge and the gun; they could have charged other things, that I think you're probably aware of from your conversations with Mr. Cicilline, to make the sentence in this case higher.

There are a lot of reasons why a higher sentence could be justified, certainly given the amounts of drugs and given your history, but for all the reasons

that Mr. Sullivan and Mr. Cicilline outlined, I don't believe a higher sentence is necessary. So I'm going to accept the recommendation today that they have provided here on the government's behalf and on your behalf.

I do want to reiterate something that I think Mr. Sullivan said, which is that because of the amount of time that you're going to do on these charges and the criminal history that you have, and given how old you'll be when you get out of prison, which will be close to 60 years old, if you were to come back to the United States and engage in this kind of activity, you would be almost guaranteeing yourself a life sentence. So if you make that choice, you're really making the choice to spend the rest of your life in prison. I don't think that's what you want to do, but I just want to make sure you know the consequences of any choices that you make.

All right. In the matter of the United States vs. Marcio Alexandro Martinez-Lara, the defendant is sentenced to -- I need to spell this out by count. It will be ten years on Counts One, Two, Three, Four, Five and Six, Seven, Eight, Nine, Ten, Eleven and Twelve and Fourteen to run concurrent with the sentence of 15 years on Count Thirteen. So the total sentence for the

defendant is 15 years, 180 months.

This will be followed by a supervised release term of five years on Counts Eight, Nine and Twelve, Thirteen, and three years on Counts One, Two, Three, Four, Five, Six, Seven, Ten and Fourteen to run concurrent with each other. So the total is five years.

There is no restitution in this case. There is no fine. There is a special assessment of \$100. The only special condition of his supervised release is as follows: Upon completion of the defendant's term of imprisonment, he will be surrendered to a duly authorized immigration official for deportation in accordance with the established procedures of the Immigration and Naturalization Act and, if deported, the defendant shall remain outside of the United States.

So the plea agreement in this case provided that the right to appeal is waived if the defendant -- or if I sentence the defendant to the recommended term of 15 years. So given that I've done that, the right to appeal is waived.

All right. Is there anything further? (Brief pause)

THE COURT: That's a misprint on the sheet.

```
It's 1300 -- no, 1400. $1400 special assessment, not
 1
 2
      100. Any other corrections or modifications?
 3
              PROBATION OFFICER: Could you Count Eleven as
 4
      well in the supervised release.
 5
              THE COURT: I thought I said Eleven, but if I
 6
      didn't, then Eleven is -- Count Eleven is three years
 7
      of supervised release also concurrent.
 8
              Anything else from the government?
9
              MR. SULLIVAN: The standard deportation
10
      condition on supervised release.
11
              THE COURT: I just said that.
12
              MR. SULLIVAN: Oh, you did. I'm sorry. I
13
      missed that part then.
14
              Finally, your Honor, I move to dismiss Count
15
      Fifteen.
16
              THE COURT: All right. And the motion to
17
      dismiss Count Fifteen is granted.
18
              Was there a forfeiture allegation here?
19
              MR. SULLIVAN:
                             There is. Two motor vehicles.
20
      The preliminary orders are already entered.
21
              THE COURT: Okay. All right. Anything else
22
      from the defendant?
              MR. CICILLINE: No, your Honor.
23
24
              THE COURT: Very good then. We'll be in recess.
25
              (Time noted:
                            2:39 p.m.)
```

| 1 | |
|----|---------------------------------------------------------------|
| 2 | CERTIFICATION |
| 3 | I certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript from the |
| 4 | record of proceedings in the above-entitled matter. |
| 5 | |
| 6 | Suns Sahuam |
| 7 | Official Court Reporter November 21, 2019 |
| 8 | |
| 9 | |
| 10 | |
| 11 | |
| 12 | |
| 13 | |
| 14 | |
| 15 | |
| 16 | |
| 17 | |
| 18 | |
| 19 | |
| 20 | |
| 21 | |
| 22 | |
| 23 | |
| 24 | |
| 25 | |
| | |